DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 272 107 HE 019 554

AUTHOR Sears, James T.; And Others
TITLE Conducting Qualitative Research in Higher Education.
PUB DATE 8 Jul 86
NOTE 49p.; Paper presented at the International Conference on the First Year Experience (1st, Newcastle upon Tyne, England, July 8, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; Interviews; Observation; Preservice Teacher Education; Program Evaluation; *Qualitative Research; *Research Methodology; Student Attitudes; *Student Experience; Surveys; *Teacher Interns
IDENTIFIERS Trinity University TX

ABSTRACT

The theory underlying qualitative research design and a specific formative evaluation study that includes qualitative methods are discussed. The focus is the data analyses methods and procedures employed in the evaluation study, as well as the strengths and weaknesses of the inquiry. Qualitative research focuses on the idiographic and operates on the tacit-intuitive level. The Brackenridge Internship in Teaching Research Project was designed to understand the collegiate experience from the perspective of students participating in an experimental teacher training program. The Brackenridge Project covers: (1) pre-professional entry (1984-1986), (2) professional training (1986-1988), and (3) professional entry (1988-1990). Phase 1 included audio- and video-taped interviews with interns, parents, and Trinity University (Texas) staff and faculty. Instruments to gauge occupational interest, career maturity, and value orientation were administered. Interns also maintained personal journals and were observed by the researchers during curricular/extracurricular activities. The second phase will include comparisons to other teacher education students, while the third phase will focus on interns' first 2 years of public school teaching. Appended are an extensive bibliography on qualitative inquiry, study questionnaires, and interview schedules and a summary of responses to questions. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED272107

Conducting Qualitative Research in Higher Education

Paper Presented at the
First International Conference
on the First Year Experience
Newcastle upon Tyne, England
8 July 1986

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John D. Marshall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

James T. Sears
Assistant Professor
Educational Leadership & Policies
Wardlaw 230
University of South Carolina-Columbia
Columbia, SC 29208

John D. Marshall
Assistant Professor
Department of Curriculum & Instruction
National College of Education
Evanston, IL 60201

Phil Moyer, Ed.D.
Drake Beam Morin, Inc.
5151 Flynn Parkway
Suite 200
Corpus Christi, TX 78411

Amy Otis-Wilborn
Assistant Professor
Department of Education
Trinity University
715 Stadium Drive
San Antonio, TX 78284

HE 019 554

ABSTRACT

In recent years, qualitative inquiry in education has been effectively used for both formative and summative program evaluation. The effectiveness and acceptance of this mode of inquiry, however, demands a theoretical and practical understanding of qualitative research design and data analyses. Using a formative evaluation study of an innovative program designed to attract freshmen to the field of education (presented at the 1986 National Freshman Year Conference), this paper will (1) explore the theory underlying qualitative research design, (2) discuss the methods and procedures employed in the data analyses of this particular study, and (3) assess the strengths and weaknesses of this type of inquiry. A variety of materials, including a formative evaluation program report and an extensive bibliography on qualitative inquiry, are appended.

META-THEORETICAL ASSUMPTIONS OF INQUIRY

The Brackenridge Internship in Teaching Research Project uses an interdisciplinary approach and seeks a broad, deep description of the everyday academic life of 17 college students participating in an experimental teacher training program (1). The primary emphasis of this research project, as well as qualitative inquiry, is intersubjective understanding. That is, an understanding of the collegiate experience from the participants' perspectives. The primary data collection tools for this type of inquiry are field notes, permanent audio and video recordings, participant observations, surveys, formal and informal interviews, and unobtrusive methods. These methods and their use in this research project are fully discussed in the third section of this paper.

Qualitative inquiry has been employed extensively in sociology and anthropology (2) and has been successfully, though selectively, used in education (3). Nevertheless, relatively few researchers are familiar with either its theory or methodology. There is, for example, a distinction between conducting qualitative inquiry and using qualitative methods. Qualitative as well as quantitative methods are means toward the researcher's goal. In conducting qualitative inquiry, the goal is to develop an understanding of the meaning which particular events have for the observed and then to place those meanings within a larger theoretical framework provided by the researcher. In conducting empirical inquiry, the end is seeking the event <u>as it is</u> (ultimately predicting and controlling that phenomenon) within a tacit theoretical framework of the researcher.

Most researchers in higher education operate within this latter paradigm (4). Their primary emphasis is control, their dominant methodology is technical and their interests lie in probabilistic certainty. In contrast, those operating within a

qualitative paradigm have as their primary emphasis intersubjective understanding (Weber's lebenswelt), their dominant methodology is phenomenological and their interest lies in dialogical interpretation. Within the naturalistic paradigm, the inquirer

> accepts as given the complex scene he [sic] encounters and takes this totality as his data base. He makes no attempt to manipulate, control or eliminate variables. Of course, [the inquirer] does not claim to account for every aspect of this totality in his analysis. He reduces the breadth of enquiry systematically to give more concentrated attention to the emerging issues. Starting with a wide angle of vision, he "zooms" in and progressively focuses on those classroom features he considers to be most salient. (Delamount & Hamilton, 1976:12-13)

While quantitative methods are generally employed by those who operate within the positivistic paradigm, they may also be used by those operating within another paradigm. What distinguishes one research paradigm from the other is not the instrument but the assumptions of those operating the instruments. The use and intent of particular research methods and procedures reflect those assumptions which are artifacts of the researcher's world view.

Before being a researcher, a person is first a member of a particular culture (Gouldner, 1971). Within each culture there is a way of looking at the world which is unique and usually unexamined. This taken-for-granted view of reality is as true in contemporary western culture as it was during the Hellenic period or during the era of the Ming Dynasty. Within the intellectual tradition of Aristotle, Bacon, Leibnitz, Comte, Pierce, Whitehead and Popper, our admiration of empiricism and reliance upon rationality reigns unquestioned. It is this world view that qualitative inquiry questions. It is those assumptions embedded within that world view which are challenged. Briefly, these assumptions will be discussed.

One cardinal rule of empiricism is objectivity. This stratagem of orthodoxy is algorithmized into coefficients, probability tables and regression formulae. The researcher seeks, often through elaborate means, to separate herself and her values from the research enterprise. The use of double-blinds, confederates, technical

language, and inferential statistics are testaments to the seriousness of this pursuit. In this quest to insure that social research is objective and value-free, the political and ethical dimensions of social inquiry are seldom acknowledged; the essential humanness of the research enterprise is lost.

Eighty years ago sociologist Charles Cooley (1902:89) observed, "[A]ny study of society that is not supported by a firm grasp of personal ideas is empty and dead, mere doctrine and not real knowledge at all." Qualitative inquiry focuses upon the personal and the person. It acknowledges that the inquirer's choice of problems and goals is prima facie a question of values. As Max Weber (1949:60-61) noted, "the very recognition of a scientific problem coincides personally with the possession of specifically oriented motives and values." Researchers operating within this mode of inquiry also acknowledge social responsibility for the manner in which their research is conducted and how the data are used. Again, Weber (1946:144) notes:

> Natural science gives us an answer to the question of what we must do if we seek to master life technically. It leaves quite aside. . .whether we should and do wish to master life technically and whether it ultimately makes sense to do so.

Within the empirical paradigm, these and other normative questions are literally buried beneath piles of statistics, projections, analyses, and technical jargon.

Within the qualitative paradigm the question is not "were you objective", but "were you fair?" That is, the role of the social researcher is to immerse herself within others' worlds honestly portraying their richness and complexity. Within this research tradition, participants are not "subjects" passively awaiting "treatment"; they are complex human beings integrally connected to the research enterprise. When the researcher abstracts himself from the world of values and ethics in the interest of objectivity the personal costs are high. As anthropologist Stanley Diamond (1972:401) cautioned, "in order to objectify the other, one is, at the same time, compelled to objectify the self."

Another cardinal concern is empirical verification. Assumptions regarding the

relationship between subject and object, the nature of causality, and the value of sensory data fall within this category. The hegemony exercised by those engaged in traditional research is well stated by two social scientists (West & Gunn, 1978:35):

> Whenever we conduct an experiment and obtain significant differences between treatment groups, we know what causes the results: it is most certainly the manipulation. An equally strong causal statement cannot be made using any non-experimental method.

This crude, pre-Einsteinian concept of cause and effect pervades educational research. Fearing "experimental contamination," researchers, through the rigor of quasi-experimental designs, seek to rid themselves of "confounding variables." For the person engaged in qualitative inquiry, however, it is precisely these "confounding variables" that are most valuable. Like the conversation between Alice and the Red and White Queens, the empiricist is mired by a reality of his own creation:

> "I wish Queens never asked questions," Alice thought to herself.
> "Don't let us quarrel," the White Queen said in an anxious tone. "What is the cause of lightning?"
> "The cause of lightning," Alice said very decidely, for she felt quite certain about this, "is the thunder--no, no! she hastily corrected herself, "I meant the other way."
> "It's too late to correct it," said the Red Queen: "when you've once said a thing, that fixes it, and you must take the consequences."

Qualitative research focuses upon the idiographic and operates on the tacit-intuitive level. Rather than attempting to isolate and control variables through elaborate scientific instruments, and discerning cause from effect through statistical manipulation, the qualitative researcher uses herself as the primary instrument through which to observe and portray the complexities of everyday life. As Alfred Schutz (1970:54) said, "all empirical sciences refer to the world as pregiven; but they and their instruments are themselves elements of this world."

The separation of cause from effect, like the separation of matter from mind, nature from spirit, and means from ends, is rooted in our Aristotelian tradition. The use of observational techniques in social research is an excellent example of

this heritage. Normal science assumes that data gathered by human beings are only valid and reliable if they are obtained through our senses and independently collaborated by others. Techniques such as inter-rater reliability have been developed to minimize observer "bias." The possibility that researchers may focus upon different aspects of a social phenomenon, that they may attach different meanings to it based upon either experiential or tacit knowledge, or that they may draw different inferences based upon such observations are viewed as strengths by those engaged in qualitative research.

Normal science assumes that "reality" exists independently of human beings and only awaits scientific methods to dissect it and scientists' intellect to understand it. "Whatever knowledge is attainable," remarked Sir Bertrand Russell, "must be attained by scientific methods; and what science cannot discover, mankind cannot know." Normal science treats as unproblematic the nature of "reality" neglecting the transcendental frame upon which the meanings of "reality" rests (Habermas, 1970). At worst, we impose an order to social phenomenon and call that construction "reality." At best, we provide an interpretive framework which, at that historical moment, seems to make the most sense. While we can never complete our search for "truth" (since the data generated from such research raises additional anomalies) neither can we hope to reduce any segment of reality in a manner that will account for all its elements. Consequently, our search becomes research.

METHODS & PROCEDURES USED IN THE BRACKENRIDGE STUDY

Chronological Summary of Research Procedures and Methods

The Brackenridge Internship in Teaching Research Study employs a three-phase design using a complimentary combination of qualitative and quantitative methods within a naturalistic inquiry paradigm. (The schedule for administration of these methods is located in Appendix B). Briefly, these stages are:

1. Pre-Professional Entry (1984-86). During this phase of the study, periodic audio and video taped interviews were conducted with the interns, their parents, and Trinity University staff and faculty. In addition, several instruments designed to gauge career interest/maturity and value orientation were administered. These instruments will be administered periodically throughout the six-year study. The Interns have also maintained personal journals recording their thoughts and feelings about life as a Brackenridge Intern, and the reseachers have served as non-participant observers during several curricular and extra-curricular activities. Finally, quantitative data was generated through the interns' completion of surveys grounded upon previous qualitative findings.

2. Professional Training (1986-88). During this second phase of the study, two cohort groups of students will be selected. One group (N=11) are Trinity students who have been admitted to the general teacher education program during the same semester (Spring 1986) as the Brackenridge Interns. While the Brackenridge Interns are expected to have unique opportunities during this phase, they will also attend the same courses as the "regular"

teacher training students. A second cohort group will be selected from a more traditional and typical teacher training program in the region. During the next four years, data will be collected from both cohort groups.

The primary focus of the inquiry, however, will continue to be the Brackenridge Interns. Observations of the interns' practicum experiences, professional coursework, and community awareness activities will be conducted. Individual and small group interviews will continue. The interns will be asked to maintain portfolios of memorable activities and accomplishments. Additional interviews will be sought with Trinity faculty members, public school professionals, and community workers involved in the interns' professional training.

3. Professional Entry (1988-90). During this phase, the interns' first two years of public school teaching will be extensively studied through on site observations, interviews with purposive samples of administrators, faculty, and students, and administration of several survey instruments. The two cohort groups of students will undergo a similar, albeit less intensive, study.

Data Analyses and Statistics

In studying this experimental university program, analytic induction (5) was used. Through a systematic review of the field research, data were grouped into categories. The categories were examined in order to discern what patterns, if any, existed within and between categories. As patterns surfaced, alternative explanations for them were generated. These explanations were related to social,

organizational, and educational theory. Based on the commonalities and discrepancies yielded from this analysis, we developed an interpretive theoretical framework which seemed best to fit the data. Eventually, the most reasonable interpretations were selected and woven together thematically. These thematic keys became the organizational framework within which data from this study have been presented (Sears, Moyer & Marshall, 1986:32-54). Data collected by each method will be discussed in this section. These data are triangulated with one another and with the statistical analyses.

Formal and Informal Interviews

Interviews were tape recorded and transcribed. Data from these interviews were handled in the following manner: To begin, each response was condensed in an effort to capture its essence in the briefest form possible (e.g., single words or collections of phrases that represented central themes) while maintaining quality and integrity. This process yielded a collection of staccato responses for every interview question. Next, patterns were sought and responses were aligned in emergent categories. Finally, a summary statement was written to describe these categories; outlying responses were noted when applicable. An example of this process is located in Appendix C.

A validity check (Lincoln & Guba, 1981) of the entire case study will be conducted by an independent academic team familiar with qualitative inquiry. These auditors will check the accuracy and the appropriateness of verbatim passages in the text, evaluate the validity of the researchers' conclusions, and have access to the data in its raw form.

Formal interviews were conducted with the interns at the beginning and end of their freshmen year, and mid-way through their sophomore year. Individual interviews

are conducted in private and usually last one hour. In addition to these individual audio interviews, small group video-taped interviews were conducted at the end of their sophomore year. Additional individual and small group interviews will be conducted during the next four years. Interviews of the two cohort groups began at the end of the study's second year. These interviews, too, will continue during the next four years.

Informal interviews are also regularly conducted with the interns during social, academic, and professional occasions. These are discussed in a later section of this report. During these conversations additional questions and issues emerged, and some structural collaboration of other data was provided. Interviews conducted in conjunction with classroom observations were most effective in picking up contextual cues and juxtaposing personal observations with participants' interpretations.

Throughout the course of this study participants shared their perceptions and candid opinions about the quality and effectiveness of this experimental program. Participants were assured of confidentiality. Pseudonyms have been used in written reports and journal articles except where personalities are part of the public domain. Quotations attributed to participants have been altered only in cases of serious grammatical errors, to enhance clarity, or to assure anonymity.

Surveys

Through the use of survey methodology, interpretations generated from previous field work may be either supported or refuted. Data generated from surveys also is the basis for further ethnographic study. Through this process of triangulation, additional insights into previous observations occur and validity and reliability are enhanced (Erickson, 1977; Sieber, 1973).

Two types of survey methodology are used in this study. First, data are gathered from four standardized instruments: The Self-Directed Search (SDS), a

vocational counseling tool that, among other information, provides a summary code keyed to a specific occupation; The Career Maturity Inventory (CMI), whose most common application is to screen individuals who are immature in their career decision-making process; The Survey of Personal Values (SPV), used as a means of identifying the values patterns of the interns as a group; and, The Survey of Interpersonal Values (SIV), designed to gauge the values that respondents attach to relationships with other people. These instruments are administered to the interns at the beginning of their freshmen and junior years and at the end of their first year of teaching. Both cohort groups also completed these instruments.

Second, data are gathered from surveys grounded upon interview and observational data. These surveys consist of Likert-type attitudinal items as well as open-ended questions. These are located in Appendix D. Additional idiographic surveys will be developed and administered to the intern group during the next four years.

Together, these data are used to check the adequacy of preliminary analysis and interpretations of qualitative data, to point toward fruitful avenues for further investigation, to test the theoretical constructs developed from the data previously analyzed, and to examine the extensiveness of the patterns suggested by qualitative analysis.

Non-Participant & Participant Observations

During the first two years of this study, the interns were observed in academic, social, and professional settings. Members of the research team observed these students during their weekly education seminars and interactions with non-interns within regular education classes. Non-participant observations were also conducted during formal receptions, informal social outings, and presentations at national conferences. Field notes were taken during most of these events. Participant

observations are conducted during the researchers' summary reports to the interns (these data are collected through videotaping) and in a course and field experiences directed by one member of the research team.

Unobtrusive Methods

Throughout the course of this study a variety of unobtrusive methods are used. During their freshmen and sophomore years, the interns maintained journals in which they recorded their thoughts and feelings about their collegiate experiences. During the next four years the interns and the cohort groups will maintain portfolios of their academic and field-based work.

In addition, document analysis of news articles discussing the interns and their program as well as reports and position papers relating to the Brackenridge Program culled from Trinity University files.

Researchers

The single most important instrument in conducting qualitative inquiry is the researcher. The ability to enter unobtrusively into the participant's world, the skills to organize oneself as well as vast amounts of data, the power to observe the complexities of everyday interaction, and the talent to analyze, integrate and present the data in a honest and compelling form are essential. Only rarely are these abilities, skills and talents found in one individual. Consequently, this research study is conducted by a four-member team. This team represents diversity in terms of geography, methodology and ideology. In addition, diversity was sought vis-a-vis familiarity with Trinity University. One member of the team has never

attended nor been employed at the research site and a second member worked at the site one year as a visiting instructor prior to the implementation of the Brackenridge Program. Two other team members have more intimate knowledge of Trinity. One researcher, completing a decade at the site, has recently joined a private consulting firm. During the first two years of this study, he worked in an administrative and teaching role within the education department. The fourth team member joined the education faculty at Trinity at the outset of this study.

STRENGTHS & WEAKNESSES IN THE USE OF QUALITATIVE INQUIRY

What are some of the problems which we confronted in conducting this particular research study? What are the merits for conducting qualitative research for program evaluation within higher education? Briefly, this section will address these questions.

There have been two major problems areas in conducting this study. First, and foremost is proximity to and relationships with participants. Following two years of study, we recognize and appreciate the ethnographer's need for cultural immersion. Despite our every effort to make ourselves available to the program's participants and to remain abreast of their experiences, nuances of the multiple everyday worlds of these interns are too infrequently experienced by members of the research team. While much unobtrusive data of everyday life as a Brackenridge Intern has been collected, much more was undoubtedly lost.

In an effort to collect become as much a part of these students' collegiate experiences, we have made conscious and continued efforts to establish and maintain close and personable relationships with these interns. We have attempted to maintain frequent telephone, letter and personal contact with these interns. However, one unfortunate and perhaps insurmountable fact is that not all of the participants share our sense of importance in the program under study. Interest levels rise and fall as interns experience the crush of finals, romantic relationships, extensive travel, and so forth. In order to capture as much of the experiences of daily life as possible, at least one member of the research team at any point of time is a faculty member within the education department at Trinity University. While the other team members regularly visit the University and routinely exchange conversations with the Brackenridge Interns, these team members remain "outsiders."

This outsider/insider dialectic is critical in generating alternative hypothesis and interpretations. Given the organizational history and dynamics within any

institution of higher education, it is essential that the research team is composed of both insiders and outsiders. Qualitative studies within institutions which grant masters and doctoral degrees can also benefit through involvement of one or more graduate students in the design, collection, and/or analysis of the data.

Every effort is made during this study to share our tentative findings with the program's participants. Through conversations and letters we share our notions and generalizations with them. We also invite all interns to participate in group discussions to react to each annual report. Furthermore, all formal research reports are shared with the program's director and are placed in a special file in the university library for review by the interns and other interested parties.

Sharing findings with those from whom the data have been collected in language unencumbered by jargon and technical detail is critical. First, participants have an opportunity to correct or refine data or interpretations of data. This type of regular communication between the researcher and the researched enhances the integrity of a qualitative study. Second, knowledge is power. Researchers have an ethical obligation to share their data and interpretations with those whom they have studied. The participants, then, may choose to ignore that knowledge or use it to reflectively examine their everyday life within their institution and their roles within it. Aside from course evaluations, higher education seldom provides students with substantive opportunities to constructively shape the institution. Few opportunities are provided to engage students (and faculty members) in substantive evaluation for critical reflection and action. Qualitative inquiry provides one opportunity.

A second problem area in conducting this inquiry has been working with a research team. Qualitative research demands extensive planning and continuous modifications and changes to the original plan. Consequently, frequent interaction among members of the research team is important. When members are scattered throughout the country, as in the case of this study, then logistical and financial

considerations assume greater importance. There is a never-ending flow of paper: data analysis, drafts of articles, revisions of interview questions, and so forth.

Nevertheless, the team approach in conducting qualitative inquiry in higher education is beneficial. First, as noted in an earlier section, it permits diversity. Time that is spent struggling over differences in interpretations or methods of data collection result in a more balanced, thorough, and fair study. Through the multiple lenses of a research team thicker representations of the phenomenon under study are possible.

Second, a multi-member research team simply can accomplish more. We are able to collect and work with multiple forms of data for effectively and efficiently. An exciting example of this is our use of video-tape data for small group interviews. The luxury of conducting additional interviews and analyzing as well as editing hours of video-tape is only possible through the team approach. Finally, a collaborative approach in conducting qualitative inquiry in higher education epitomizes the concept of the university as a community of scholars. Institutional structures, reward systems, and organizational histories often preclude scholarly collaboration (Sears, 1984) and thereby tend to favor traditional research methods. By breaking down artificial departmental boundaries, eliminating penalties for multi-authored articles, and legitimizing alternative forms of research, leaders in higher education can encourage qualitative inquiry.

ENDNOTES

1. For a complete report of the first year of this program see: Sears, Moyer, & Marshall, 1986. For an overview of the Brackenridge Interns in Teaching curriculum see: Marshall & Moyer, in press. Newspaper and magazine descriptions of the program include: AACTE, 1984; American Teacher, 1984; LaFranchi, 1985; Hall, 1984; Ingalls, 1984

2. See, for example: Cicourel, 1974; Douglas, 1976; Havighurst, 1962; Lynd & Lynd, 1929; Ogbu, 1974; Radin, 1926; Thrasher, 1927.

3. Consult: Burnett, 1969; Bussis & Chittendon, 1976; Powell, Farrar & Cohen, 1985; Cusick, 1983; Keddie, 1971; Lightfoot, 1983; Mehan, 1978; Rist, 1979; Rosenbaum, 1976; Sears, 1984; Smith & Geoffrey, 1968; Willis, 1977.

4. Three paradigms exist today in educational research. The empirical or rationalist paradigm, representing the traditional approach, is best articulated by Ayer, Nagel, and Popper; the phenomenological or qualitative paradigm is rooted in the philosophical tradition of Husserl, Mead, and Schutz; the critical or conflict paradigm relies on the work of Habermas, Horkheimer, and Weber. A selected bibliography for each paradigm is located in Appendix A.

5. According to Robinson (1951:813), the most concise statement of the process of analytic induction is, first to formulate a rough definition of the phenomenon to be explained, then to develop a hypothetical explanation of that phenomenon. At that point, one case is studied in the light of the hypothesis with the object determining whether the hypothesis fits the facts in that case. If the hypothesis does not fit the fact, either the hypothesis is reformulated or the phenomenon to be explained is re-defined. Practical certainty may be attained after a small number of cases has been examined, but the discovery by the researcher of a single negative case disproves the explanation thus requiring reformulation of the original hypothesis. This procedure of examining cases, re-defining the phenomenon, and reformulating the hypothesis is continued until a universal relationship is established.

REFERENCES

AACTE, (1984, April). Recruiting the best. AACTE Briefs, p. 9, 14.

American Teacher, (1984, November). A boost for education. American Teacher, p 10.

Burnett, J. (1969). Ceremony, rites and economy in the student system of an American high school. Human organization, 28 (1), 1-10.

Bussis, A. & Chittendon, E. (1976). Beyond surface curriculum. Boulder: Westview Press.

Cicourel, A., et al. (1974). Language use and school performance. New York: Academic Press.

Cooley, C. (1902). Human nature and social order. New York: Scribners.

Cusick, P. (1983). The Egalitarian ideals and the American high school. New York: Longman.

Delamount, S. & Hamilton D. (1976). Classroom research. In M. Stubbs and S. Delamont (Eds.), Exploration in classroom observations London: Wiley.

Diamond, S. (1972). Anthropology in question. In D. Hymes (Ed.). Reinventing Anthropology. (pp. 401-429). New York: Pantheon.

Douglas, J. (1976). Investigative social research. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Erickson, F. (1977). Some approaches to inquiry in school-community ethnography. Anthropology and Education Quarterly. 8, 58-69.

Gouldner, A. (1971). The coming crisis in sociology. New York: Avon.

Habermas, J. (1970). Knowledge and interest. In D. Emmet & A. MacIntyre (Eds.), Sociological theory and philosophical analysis. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul

Hall, G. (1984, October 1). Future teachers tire of defending choice. San Antonio Express, p 23.

Havighurst, R., et al. (1962). Growing up in River City. New York: Wiley.

Ingalls, Z. (1984, June 6). Ideas. Chronicle of Higher Education. p. 20.

Keddie, N. (1971). Classroom knowledge. In M. Young (Ed.), Knowledge and control (pp. 133-160). London: Collier-MacMillan.

LaFranchi, H. (1985, April 5). Encouraging tomorrow's teachers. Christian Science Monitor. p. 21-22.

Lincoln Y. & Guba, E. (1981). Naturalistic Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Lightfoot, S. (1983). The good high school. New York: Basic.

Lynd, R., & Lynd, H. (1929). Middleton. New York: Harcourt & Brace.

Marshall, J. & Moyer, P. (in press). Building strong foundations for teacher-leaders:

The Brackenridge internship in teaching project's first-year curriculum. Teaching Education.

Mehan, H., (1978). Structuring school structure. Harvard Education Review, 48 (February), 32-64.

Ogbu, J. (1974). The next generation. New York: Academic Press.

Powell, A., Farrar, E., & Cohen, D. (1985). shopping mall high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Radin, P. (1926). Crashing Thunder: The autobiography of an American indian. New York: Appleton.

Rist, R. (1979). The invisible children. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Robinson, W. (1951). The logical structure of analytic induction. American Sociological Review, 16 (6), 812-818.

Rosenbaum, J. (1976). Making inequality: The hidden curriculum of high school training. New York: Wiley.

Sears, J. (1985). A critical ethnography of teacher education programs at Indiana University: An inquiry into the perceptions of students and faculty regarding quality and effectiveness. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1984,). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 2072A.

——, Moyer, P. & Marshall, J. (1986). A longitudinal study of a demonstration project related to the recruitment, preparation and retention of highly qualitifed persons for the teaching profession: The Brackenridge Interns. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service)

Schultz, A. (1970). Alfred Schutz on phenomenology and social relations. H. Wagner (Ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Sieber, S. (1973). The integration of fieldwork and survey methods. American Journal of Sociology, 78 (6), 1335-1359.

Smith, L. & Geoffrey, W. (1968). The complexities of an urban classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Thrasher, F. (1927). The gang. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Weber, M. (1946). From Max Weber: Essays in sociology. (H. Gerth & C. Wright Mills, Tarnds. & Eds.). New York: Oxford University Press.

West, S. & Gunn S. (1978). Some issues of ethics and social psychology. American Psychologists. 33, 30-38.

Willis, P. (1977). Learning to labour: How working class kids get working class jobs. Westmead, England: Saxon House.

APPENDIX A

PHENOMENOLOGICAL

Bartky, S. "Toward a phenomenology of feminist consciousness" in M. Vetterling-Braggin, Elliston, F. and English, J. (Eds.), Feminism and Philosophy. New Brunswick, NJ: Littlefield-Adams, 1977, 22-37.

Berger, P. and Luckman, T. The Social Construction of Reality. New York, NY: Anchor Books, 1967.

Blumer, H. Symbolic Interactionism. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Bogdan, R. and Biken, S. Quantitative Research for Education. Boston, MA: Allyn-Bacon, 1982.

Brinberg, D. Forms of Validity in Research. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 19.

Bussie, A., Chittenden, E. and Amarel, M. Beyond Surface Curriculum. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1976.

Cicourel, A. V. Cognitive Sociology. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penquin Books, 1973.

Cicourel, A. Language Use and School Performance. New York, NY: Academic Press, 1974.

Cicourel, A. and Kitsuse, J. The Educational Decision Makers. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs Merrill, 1963.

Cottle, T. and Weisse, R. The Narrative Voice. New York, NY: Basic Books, 1984.

Cusick, P. The Equaltarian Ideal and the American High School. New York, NY: Longman, 1983.

Denzin, N. "The research act", In J. Manis and B. Meltzer (Eds.), Symbolic Interactionism, Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1972, 340-80.

Denzin, N. The Research Act. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1978.

Dobbert, M. L. Ethnographic Research. New York, NY: Praeger, 1982.

Douglas, J. D. (Ed.). Deviance and Respectability: The Social Construction of Moral Meanings. New York, NY: Basic Books, 1970.

Douglas, J. D. (Ed.). The Social Meanings of Suicide. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Douglas, J. Understanding Everyday Life. London England: Rutledge and Kegal Paul, 1971.

Eisner, E. The Educational Imagination. New York, NY: MacMillan, 1979.

Esland, G. The Construction of Reality. Bletchley England: Open University Press, 1972.

Filstead, W. Qualitative Methodology. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally, 1970.

Garfinkel, H. Studies in Ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. The Discovery of Grounded Theory. London England: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1968.

Glaser, B. Theoretical Sensitivity: Advances in the Methodology of Grounded Theory. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press, 1978.

Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. Chicago, IL: Aldine, 1967.

Goffman, E. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1959.

Guba, Egon and Lincoln, Y. Effective Evaluation. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Hamilton, D. Beyond the Number Game. London England: Macmillan, 1977.

Hegel, G. W. The Phenomenology of Mind. Translated by J. B. Baillie. New York, NY: Macmillan, 1949.

Hirsh, E. D. Validity and Interpretation. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1976.

Huberman, A. M. and Miles, M. "Drawing Valid Meaning from Qualitative Data: Some Techniques of Data." Quality and Quantity. 17 (83, 4), 281-339.

Husserl, E. The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology. Translated with an introduction by D. Carr. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1970.

Hyman, H. Interviewing in Social Research. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Hymes, Dell (Ed.). Reinvening Anthropology. New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1972.

Jackson, P. Life in Classrooms. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Johnson, J. Doing Field Research. New York, NY: Free Press, 1977.

Kaplan, A. The Conduct of Inquiry. Aylesbury England: Intertext Books, 1964.

Kushner, S. and Norris, N. "Interpretation, Negotiation and Validity in Naturalistic Research." Interchange, 1 (February, 1981), 26-36.

Laslett, B. and Rapport, R. "Collaborative Interviewing and Interactive Research." Journal of Marriage and the Family, ( ), _____.

Lofland, J. Doing Social Life. New York, NY: Wiley, 1976.

Mead, G. Mind, Self and Society. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, 1934.

Mehan, H. and Wood, H. The Reality of Ethnomethodology. New York, NY: Wiley, 1975.

Merleau-Ponty, M. Phenomenology of Perception. Translated by Colin Smith. New York, NY: Humanities Press, 1962.

Miles, M. and Huberman, J. Qualitative Data Analysis. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1984.

Natanson, M. (Ed.). Phenomenology and the Social Sciences. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.

Peshkin, A. Growing Up American: Schooling and the Survival of Community. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, (1978).

Polkinghorne, D. Methodology for the Human Sciences: Systems of Inquiry. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1983.

Psathas, G. Phenomenological Sociology. New York, NY: Wiley, 1973.

Reason, P. and Rowan, J., (Eds.). Human Inquiry: A Sourcebook of New Paradigm Research. New York, NY: Wiley, 1981.

Ricoeur, P. Husserl: An Analysis of His Phenomenology. Translated by Ballard and Embree. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1967.

Rist, R. The Urban School. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1973.

Ritchie, T. In Praise of Idiosyncratic Study. Interchange, 13 (April, 1982), 31-38.

Roache, M. Phenomenology, Language and the Social Sciences. London England: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.

Schatzman, L. and Strauss, A. Field Research. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Scholte, R. "The Structural Anthropology of Claude Levi-Strauss." In John J. Honigam (Ed.), Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally, 1973.

Schutz, A. The Phenomenology of the Social World. Translated by Walsh and Lehnert. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1967.

Schutz, Alfred. Reflections on the Problems of Relevance. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1970.

Schutz, A. and Luckman, T. The Structures of the Life-World. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.

Sharpe, S. Just Like A Girl. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1976.

Schwartz, H. and Jacobs, J. Qualitative Sociology. New York, NY: Free Press, 1979.

Smith, N. (Ed.). New Techniques for Evaluation. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1981.

Spiegleberg, H. Phenomenology in Psychology and Psychiatry. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1972.

Spindler, G. Doing the Ethnography of Schooling: Educational Ethnography in Action. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Spradley, James P. The Ethnographic Interview. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.

Stack, R. Evaluating the Arts in Education: An Approach. Columbus, OH: Merrill, 1975.

Stenhouse, L. "Case Study and Case Records." British Educational Research Journal. 4 (February, 1978), 21-39.

Stenhouse, L. Curriculum Research and Development in Action. London England: Heinemann, 1980.

Tripp, D. "Co-authorship and Negotiation: The Interview As Act of Creation." Interchange, 14 (33, 1983), 32-45.

Van Maanen, J. Qualitative Research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1983.

Van Maanen, J. Varieties of Qualitative Research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1982.

Wax, R. Doing Fieldwork. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Whyte, W. Street Corner Society. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Willis, G. Qualitative Evaluation. Berkeley, CA: McCutchen, 1978.

Zaner, R. W. "Theory of Intersubjectivity: Alfred Schutz." Social Research, 28 (1961), 71-93.

CRITICAL

Anyon, J. "Adequate Social Science, Curriculum Investigations, and Theory." Theory into Practice, 21 (1, 1982), 34-37.

Apple, M. Education and Power. Boston, MA: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.

Apple, M. and Weis, L. (Eds.). Ideology and Practice in Schooling. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1983.

Apple, M. "The Other Side of the Hidden Curriculum: Correspondence Theories and the Labor Process," Interchange, 11 (March, 1979), 5-22.

Apple, M. "Reproduction and Contradiction in Education: An Introduction." In M. Apple (Ed.), Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education: Essays on Class, Ideology and the State. Boston, MA: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.

Bernstein, R. Praxis and Action. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971.

Birnbaum, N. Toward a Critical Sociology. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Brown, D. and Rajesh, T. "Interviews as Catalysts," Journal of Applied Psychology, 63 (2, 1978), 197-205.

Bullough, R., Goldstein, S., and Holt, L. Human Interest in the Curriculum. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 1984.

Carr, D. Phenomenology and the Problems of History. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1974.

Carlson, D. "Making Student 'Types': The Link Between Professional and Commonsense Knowledge Systems and Educational Practice," Interchange, 11 (2, 1980), 11-29.

Daniels, A. "Feminist Perspectives in Sociological Research" In M. Millman and R. Kanter (Eds.), Another Voice, New York, NY: Anchor, 1975, 340-80.

Davis, B. Life in the Classroom and Playground. London England: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.

Feinberg, W. Understanding Education: Toward a Reconstruction of Educational Inquiry. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Habermas, J. Knowledge and Human Interests. Translated by Jeremy J. Shapiro. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1971.

Habermas, J. Legitimation Crisis. Translated by Thomas McCarthy. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1975.

Habermas, J. Theory and Practice. Translated by John Viertel. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1973.

Habermas, J. Toward a Rational Society. Translated by Jeremy J. Shapiro. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1970.

Hall, B. "Participatory Research: An Approach for Change," Convergence, 8 (2, 1975), 24-31.

Hall, B. "Knowledge as a Commodity and Participatory Research." Prospects, 9 (4, 1979), 393-408.

Holly, D. Beyond Curriculum. London England: Hart-Davis and Mac Gibbon, 1973.

Horkheimer, M. Critical Theory. New York, NY: Seabury Press, 1972.

Jay, M. The Dialectical Imagination. Boston, MA: Little, Brown, 1973.

Kelly, A. "Feminism and Research," Women's Studies International Quarterly, 1978), 225-52.

Kidder, L. Face Validity from Multiple Perspectives. In D. Brinberg and L. Kidder (Eds.), New Directions for Methodology of Social and Behavioral Science: Forms of Validity in Research, No. 12. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1982, 41-61.

Lather, P. "Critical Theory, Curricular Transformation and Feminist Mainstreaming." Journal of Education, 66 (1, 1984), 49-62.

McRobbie, A. "Working Class Girls and the Culture of Femininity." In Women's Studies Group. (Ed.). Women Take Issue: Aspects of Women's Subordination, London England: Hutchinson, 1978, 96-108.

Miller, J. "The Resistance of Women Academics: An Autobiographical Account." The Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 3 (2, 1983), 101-109.

Rutter, M. Fifteen Thousand Hours. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Schroyer, T. The Critique of Domination. New York, NY: Braziller, 1973.

Sharp, R and Green, A. Knowledge, Ideology, and the Politics of Schooling: Towards a Marxist Analysis of Education. London England: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980.

Smart, B. Sociology, Phenomenology and Marxian Analysis. Boston, MA: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976.

Stanley, L. and Wise, S. Breaking Out: Feminist Consciousness and Feminist Research. Boston, MA: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983.

Walker, S. and Barton, L. Gender, Class and Education. Sussex England: Falmer, 1983.

Willis, P. Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs. Teakfield, England: Saxon House, 1977.

Woods, P. and Hammersley (Eds.). The Process of Schooling. London England: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976.

Woods, P. and Hammersley, M. (Eds.). School Experience. London England: Croom Helm, 1977.

ANALYTICAL EMPIRICAL

Amidon, E., and Hough, J. (Eds.). Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research, and Application: Reading MA: Addison Wesley, 1967.

Ariav, T. and Atkins, E. "Curriculum Clarification, Systems." Paper presented at the annual meeting of The American Educational Research Association. Montreal Canada, 1983.

Austin, J. L. How to Do Things with Words. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Ayer, A. The Foundations of Empirical Knowledge. London England: Macmillan, 1963.

Ayer, A. Language, Trust, and Logic. London England: Gollancz, 1949.

Ayer, A. Logical Positivism. Glencoe IL: Free Press, 1959.

Barzum, J., and Graff, H. The Modern Researcher. New York NY: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962.

Belcastro, F. "Use of Selected Factors as Predictors of Success in Completing a Secondary Teacher Education Program." Educational and Psychological Measurement, 35(January, 1975), 957-962.

Bergmann, G. Meaning and Existence. Madison WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1959.

Black, M. Language and Philosophy: Studies and Methods. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 1949.

Blanshard, B. Reason and Analysis. London England: Allen and Unwin, 1962.

Bloom, B. "New Directions of Educational Research - Alternative Variables." Phi Delta Kappan, 61(June, 1980), 382-385.

Blumberg, A. and Feigl, H. "Logical Postivism: A New Movement in European Philosophy." The Journal of Philosophy, 28(November, 1931), 281-296.

Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life. New York NY: Basic, 1976.

Braithwaite, R. Scientific Explanation. Cambridge MA: Cambridge University Press, 1953.

Butrick, R. Carnap in Meaning and Analyticity. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton, 1970.

Campbell, D. and Stanley, J. "Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research on Teaching." In N. George (Ed.). Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago IL: Rand McNally, 1963,

Carnap, R. The Logical Structure of the World. Translated by R. George. Berkeley CA: University of California Press, 1967.

Clark, B. "The 'Cooling-Out' Function in Higher Education." American Journal of Sociology. 65(May, 1960), 569-576.

Coleman, J. The Adolescent Society. Glencoe IL: Free Press, 1960.

Coleman, J., et al. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1966.

Cronbach, L., and Furby, L. "How Should We Measure 'Change' - Or Should We?" Psychological Bulletin. 74(January, 1970), 68-80.

Dillon, J. "The Classification of Research Questions." Review of Educational Research. 54(March, 1984), 327-361.

Dreeben, R. On What is Learned in School. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

Durkheim, E. The Rules of Sociological Method. New York NY: Free Press, 1964.

Feibleman, J. Foundations of Empiricism. The Hague, Netherlands: Nijhoff, 1962.

Fodore, J. and Katz, J. (Eds.). Philosophy of Language. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Gollo, D. and Clements, D. "The Effects of Kindergarten Schedule on Achievement, Classroom Behavior, and Attendance." The Journal of Educational Research. 78(January, 1984), 51-56.

Gorovitz, S. and Williams, R. Philosophical Analysis: An Introduction to Its Language and Techniques. New York NY: Random House, 1969.

Gregg, J. The Language of Taxonomy. New York NY: Columbia University Press, 1954.

Halfpenny, P. Positivism and Sociology. Edison NJ: Allen and Unwin, 1982.

Hanfling, O. Logical Positivism. Oxford England: Brackwell, 1981.

Hempel, C. Aspects of Scientific Explanation. New York NY: Free Press, 1965.

Hempel, C. Aspects of Scientific Explanation. New York NY: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Hintikka, J. (Ed.). Scientific Method as a Problem-Solving and Question-Answering Technique. Dordrecht Holland: Reidel, 1981.

Hirst, P. and Peters, R. S. The Logic of Education. London England: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970.

Hirst, P. "The Logic of the Curriculum": Journal of Curriculum Studies 1(February, 1969), 142-158.

Jackson, G., and Cosca, C. "The Inequality of Educatinal Opportunity in the Southwest." American Educational Research Journal. 11(March, 1974), 219-229.

Jencks, C., et al. Inequality. New York NY: Basic, 1972.

Jensen, A. Educational Differences. London England: Methuen, 1973.

Jorgensen, J. The Development of Logical Empiricism. Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Kaila. E. Reality and Experience. Translated by A. Kirschenmann and P. Kirschenmann. Boston MA: Reidel, 1979.

Katz, J. The Philosophy of Language. New York NY: Harper and Row, 1966.

Kerlinger, F. Behavioral Research. New York NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.

Kerr, W. "Experiments on the Effect of Music on Factory Production." Applied Psychology Monographs. No. 5 (1945).

Koerner, S. Categorical Frameworks. Oxford England: Blackwell, 1970.

Lambert, K. (Ed.). The Logical Way of Doing Things. New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1969.

Laun, M. and Barton, L. (Eds.). Rethinking Curriculum Studies. New York NY: Wiley, 1981.

Mach, E. The Analysis of Sensation. New York NY: Dover, 1959.

Martin, M. Concept of Science Education: A Philosophical Analysis. New York NY: Scott, Foresman, 1972.

Morick, H. (Ed.). Challenges to Empiricism. Indianapolis IN: Hackett, 1980.

Morris, C. Logical Positivism, Pragmatism and Scientific Empiricism. Paris France: Herman et cie, 1937.

Nagel, E. The Structure of Science. New York NY: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961.

Nagel, E. "Philosophy of Science and Educational Theory." Studies in Philosophy and Education. 7(January, 1969), 5-27.

Nagel, E. Teleology Revisited. New York NY: Columbia University Press, 1979.

Pascarella, "Interaction of Motivation, Mathematics Preparation, and Instructional Methods in PSI and a Coventionally Taught Calculus Course." AV Communication Review. 25(Spring, 1977), 25-41.

Peters, R. S. (Ed.). The Concept of Education. London England: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 19 .

Phillip, D. "After the Wake: Post Positivist Educational Thought." Educational Researcher. 12(May, 1983), 4-12.

Popper, K. Objective Knowledge. Oxford England: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Popper, K. The Poverty of Historicism. Boston MA: Beacon, 1957.

Popper, K. Objective Knowledge. Oxford England: Clarendon, 1972.

Popper, K. "Degree of Confirmation." British Journal for the Philosophy of Science. 5(May, 1954), 143-9.

Popper, K. The Logic of Discovery. New York NY: Basic Books, 1959.

Pratte, R. Ideology and Education. New York NY: McKay, 1977.

Pratte, R. Contempory Theories of Education. Scranton PA: International Textbook. 1971.

Radcliffe-Brown, A. A Natural Science of Society. Glencoe IL: Free Press, 1956.

Rescher, W. Empirical Inquiry. Totowa NJ: Rowman and Lifflefield, 1982.

Rosenhultz, S. and Simpson, C. "The Formation of Ability Conceptions." Review of Educational Research. 54(January, 1984), 31-63.

Rosenthal, R. and Jackson, L. Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Rosenthal, R. and Rosnow, R. (Eds.). Artifact in Behavioral Research. New York NY: Academic Press, 1969.

Rosnow, R. (Eds.). Artifact in Behavioral Research. New York NY: Academic Press, 1969.

Rotter, G. and Portugal, S. "Group and Individual Effects in Problem-Solving." Journal of Applied Psychology. 53(April, 1969), 338-41.

Royce, R. "R. S. Peters and Moral Education." The Journal of Moral Education. 12(March, 1953), 174-181.

Scheffler, J. Science and Subjectivity. Indianapolis IN: Bobbs-Merrill, 1967.

Schlick, M. General Theory of Knowledge. Translated by A. Blumberg. New York NY: Springer-Verlag, 1974.

Schlick, M. Philosophy of Nature. Translated by A. Zeppelin. New York NY: Philosophical Library, 1949.

Selman, R. and Liverman, M. "Moral Education in the Primary Grades: An Evaluation of a Developmental Curriculum." Journal of Educational Psychology. 67(May, 1975), 712-16.

Shulman, L. (Ed .) Review of Research in Education. Itasca IL: Peacock, 1977.

Shulman, L. "Disciplines of Inquiry in Education." Educational Researcher 10(June, 1981), 5-12.

Steiner, E. Logical and Conceptual Analytic Techniques for Educational Researchers. Washington DC: University Press of America, 1978.

Sternberg, R. (Ed.). Handbook of Human Intelligence. New York NY: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Toulmin, S. Foresight and Understanding. New York NY: Haper and Row, 1961.

Tuckman, B. Conducting Educational Research. (2nd Ed.) New York NY: Harcourt, 1978.

Walberg, H. et al. "Exceptional Performance." Review of Educational Research. 54(January, 1984), 87-112.

Walker, D. and Schaffarzick, J. "Comparing Curriculum." Review of Educational Research. 44(January, 1974), 83-111.

Weick, K. "Systematic Observation Methods." In G. Lindsey and E. Aronson (Eds.), The Handbook of Social Psychology. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley, 1968. Winch, P. The Idea of Social Science. London England: Humanities, 1958.

Winnifred, F. and Hoedt, K. "The Effect of Praise Upon Quality and Quantity of Creative Writing." Journal of Educational Research. 60(February, 1966), 80-83.

Wittgenstein, L. Tractatus-Logico-Philosophcus. London England: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961.

APPENDIX B

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BRACKENRIDGE INTERNS RESEARCH PROJECT

Activity	PRE PROFESSIONAL Interns and Trinity Freshmen 1984-85 F	Sp	S	1985-86 F	Sp	S	PROFESSIONAL Interns and Professional Cohorts 1986-87 F	Sp	S	1987-88 F	Sp	S	Employment (Induction) 1988-89 F	Sp	S	1989-90 F	Sp	S
Interviews																		
Interns	X	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	X	X	-	-	X	-
Education Faculty	X	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-
Parents	X	X	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-
Cohorts	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	X	-	X	X	-	-	X	-
Public School Personnel	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	-	-	X	-
Instruments																		
SDS	X	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	X	-	-
CMI	X	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	X	-	-
SIV	X	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	X	-	-
_____	X	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	X	-	-
Student Evaluation of Teaching	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-
Observations																		
Seminar	X	X	-	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	-	X	X	-
Field Experience	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Employment-Teaching	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	-	X	X	-
Trinity University Faculty Evaluation of Student	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Journal Review	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-
Reports	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X
Professional Meetings	X	-	X	-	-	X	-	X	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	X

APPENDIX C

10. In what ways do you seem to be different than the other interns?

A-desire to coach; others overly concerned with academics
B-"I want to learn all I can"
C-not much different; describes self as "average"
D-(no response, but intern is only parent in the group)
E-more quiet; more private
F-not majoring in "hard core" subject; more verbal
G-different sense of humor
H-emphasis on elementary, not secondary, education; at first, felt other interns were more competitive, that she "didn't measure up"
I-math major; says all interns are different
J-(inaudible tape)
K-more committed to teaching as a career (beyond BIT) than some interns
L-less "technical" view of teaching; less intelligent; more able to relate to struggle
M-different major; less verbal; less dependent on group for identity
N-no differences
O-less outspoken (others are better with words); less intelligent (many interns were National Merit finalists)
P-not as smart as some
Q-more prior knowledge, re: education; better communicator; broader education; less feeling/caring

Summary of Question #10 (14 responses)

When asked how they were different from the other interns, several answered that they were not much different or that "we're all different." (Note: One intern has a small child and is, thus, the only parent in the group.) Three interns believe that they are less intelligent than some of the others and five students noted the difference in their discipline areas (e.g., music, mathematics). Two categories, however, stand out. Half the respondents see themselves as having different personality traits; these include being (more or less) outspoken, having a different sense of humor, being less caring, and feeling less dependent on the group for identity. An equal proportion of the responses described differences in interns' views and commitments toward their education and/or teaching in general. These responses included being (more or less) academically competitive, having a different view of teaching, having a different feeling about their own education, and having a greater commitment to the profession.

A-procrastinates (others are more prepatory), more spontaneous and outgoing, gets along with all others (some don't)

B-interns "probably more alike than I realize . . . I'm not sure there is an intern group . . . I don't know them very well" (group seldom socializes)

C-struggling more academically; will be in teaching longer than the two required years; no major differences

D-only parent; more concerned with grades

E-keeps more to self; makes friends slower (only friends with five or six interns)

F-more verbal and outspoken; more obvious sense of humor

G-less serious, has a sense of humor, likes all the interns, values how other interns feel toward her

H-elementary education major; different personal views (can't explain); fewer social contacts

I-interest in math (shared with one other intern); interest in sports (shared with some others); nothing extremely different ("how else could we all be a group?")

J-not as materialistic

K-"I worry too much"

L-quiet; slower to share ideas with others

M-more reserved; asks more questions and talks more in seminars

N-different life priorities; puts knowledge before grades; others don't grow in other areas as much; more excited about BIT and teaching; more accepting outlook toward people and all members of group

O-implies that she and some interns are more "social" (less concerned with work, grades, etc.) than others

P-more of a learner; lives off-campus with parents; "I've always been myself. I don't have to be doing what everyone else does"

Q-only fraternity member; anti-social; better communicator/debater

Summary of Question #12 (17 responses)

Most differences perceived by interns betwen themselves and other members of the group were academic and/or social differences. Five interns believe themselves to be more concerned about their studies than their peers, while two claim less concern about studies. Six interns see themselves as more sociable, while seven see themselves as being less sociable.

Three interns spoke of their ability to get along with all of the others as a difference between themselves and the other interns, and three made mention of their interest in and commitment to the program and teaching as a factor that sets them apart.

Differences in content areas, fraternal affilitation, etc., were mentioned by six of the interns, and one said he had held onto his identity despite the lure of groupness.

Only two interns believed that there was little distinguishable difference between themselves and the other interns. One said the interns were "probably a lot more alike than I realize." "How else could we be a group?" asked the other.

HOW ARE YOU DIFFERENT THAN OTHER INTERNS

Three categories emerged (all mine):

1. "Personal/Social" (includes, e.g., more or less outspoken and more or less group-oriented)
2. "Academic/Educative" (includes, e.g., more or less academically competitive and views teaching differently)
3. "Other" (includes, e.g., different content areas, less intelligent, different social organizations, and no different/all different)

Early interviews found respondents about evenly balanced between recognizing "personal/social" and "academic/educative" differences between themselves and the other interns. At that time, three interns felt themselves to be "less intelligent" than the others. No like responses were offered in the 85 interviews. Responses in 85 were twice as likely to fall under the "personal/social" category than the "academic'educative" one, suggesting that interns more readily see themselves as equals academically as well as in their shared commitment. Especially interesting were the 85 comments of three interns who mentioned that what made them different than the others was their ability to get along with everyone in the intern group. Two interns (compared to one in 84) now believe that there are no real differences among the group's members.

APPENDIX D

Name_____

Directions:
Please rate the following statements in terms of how much you agree or disagree. Consider the Trinity Teacher Education program and the students now enrolled in the program to answer. Circle the number on the answer sheet, using the guide below.

SD= Strongly Disagree	D= Disagree	NO= No opinion	A= Agree	SA= Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

1. The Teacher Education (TE) program has had a positive effect on my life.

2. Dr. Moore has provided good leadership for the TE program.

3. I will be better prepared to teach than graduates from other teacher training programs.

4. Membership in the TE program is worth the amount of time and effort required.

5. I grow more committed to teaching every semester.

6. Teaching is one of the most important professions.

7. The TE students as a group are more capable than most teachers in the profession today.

8. I am satisfied with the TE program.

9. I have found many Trinity professors who serve as excellent teacher role models.

10. The TE program has given me an extra good start in my career as a teacher.

11. I view teaching as a lifetime career.

12. The TE students as a group will be activists for improving education in Bexar County.

13. The TE program has helped me to develop more self-confidence than I would have experienced as a regular Trinity student.

14. I am satisfied with the other students in the TE program.

15. The TE program has fostered important personal relationships.

Name_____

16. I've spent an unreasonable amount of energy and time on the TE program requirements.

17. The TE program facilitates understanding of myself, teaching, and the San Antonio community.

18. The only reason I chose teaching is because of the convenience factors (hours, vacations, etc.).

19. Many of the TE students will achieve special recognition or leadership positions at Trinity.

20. Dr. Moore has been helpful to me this year.

21. The TE graduates will make a dramatic positive impact on the teaching profession in Bexar County.

22. I am tired of defending my decision to become a teacher.

23. Trinity University has contributed to my academic and personal growth and development.

24. People in the TE program are attractive as group members.

25. Dr. Moore's leadership is central to the success of the TE program.

26. Nearly everyone in the TE group has the qualities to be an extraordinary teacher.

27. I am satisfied with Trinity University.

28. I am very enthusiastic about teaching as a career.

29. The TE program is a memorable aspect of my sophomore year at Trinity.

30. There are many annoying aspects to the TE program.

Questionnaire

Name_____

Directions: Please answer the questions below following the specific directions given for each. Be as honest and complete as possible as your answers are confidential.

1. Describe two of the most pleasing benefits of the Teacher Education program?

1)

2)

2. Describe two of the most annoying features of the Teacher Education program.

1)

2)

3. Rate the degree to which you feel each word or phrase completes the following sentence and describes the Teacher Education program.
(Circle the number)

SD= Strongly Disagree	D= Disagree	NO= No Opinion	A= Agree	SA= Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

The Teacher Education program is:

Significant	1	2	3	4	5
Innovative	1	2	3	4	5
Challenging	1	2	3	4	5
Demanding	1	2	3	4	5
Reasonable	1	2	3	4	5
Attention-getting	1	2	3	4	5
Gratifying	1	2	3	4	5
Unique	1	2	3	4	5

4. How influential are the following individuals in your career choice? (Circle the number)

NI= No Influence
LI= Little Influence
SI= Some Influence
VI= Very Influential

	1	2	3	4
Field Experience Teachers	1	2	3	4
Peers	1	2	3	4
University Faculty	1	2	3	4
Dr. Moore	1	2	3	4
High School Teacher	1	2	3	4
Other (Please specify): _____	1	2	3	4

5. Students list the following features as attractive as they relate to teaching as a career. Rate each feature below in terms of how important each feature is to you personally. (Circle the number)

NI= Not Important
MI= Moderately Unimportant
AI= Average Importance
MI= Moderately Important
VI= Very Important

	1	2	3	4	5
Vacations	1	2	3	4	5
Working with people	1	2	3	4	5
Filling a societal need	1	2	3	4	5
Hours	1	2	3	4	5
Salary	1	2	3	4	5
Development of transferable skills	1	2	3	4	5
Opportunity to influence learning	1	2	3	4	5
Participate in the reform movement	1	2	3	4	5
opportunity for advancement	1	2	3	4	5
Other (Please list): _____	1	2	3	4	5

How does your commitment to teaching compare with the other students? (Circle the number)

Less Committed		About the same level of committment		More Committed
1	2	3	4	5

7. How is the teaching profession thought of by other students at Trinity? (Circle the number)

Not well thought of		Neutral Opinions		Very well thought of
1	2	3	4	5

8. What kind of reaction do acquaintances with whom you share your career choice have? (Circle the number)

Negative	Somewhat Negative	Neutral	Somewhat Positive	Positive
1	2	3	4	5

9. What do you see yourself doing five years after you graduate from the Trinity Education Program? (Please check all that are applicable)

_____ Raising a family

_____ Married

_____ Moving up the Career Ladder

_____ Attending graduate school in field of education

_____ Continuing my education in another field

_____ Working in a profession other than teaching

_____ Other (please specify):_____

10. What are the three careers, other than teaching, that you have thought about since entering Trinity?

1)_____

2)_____

3)_____

11. What other possible college majors have become attractive to you since entering Trinity? (Please list)

1)_____

2)_____

3)_____

12. List your three favorite Trinity University professors. (Can be from any department)

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

13. What part of the Trinity experience has contributed most to your growth?

14. Rate the degree to which the following items describe you. (Circle the number)

NLM= Not like me — SLM= Somewhat like me — JLM= Just like me

1 2 3 4 5

Popular	1	2	3	4	5
Self-centered	1	2	3	4	5
Intelligent	1	2	3	4	5
Fair	1	2	3	4	5
Committed to teaching	1	2	3	4	5
High Achieving	1	2	3	4	5
Goal oriented	1	2	3	4	5
Ambitious	1	2	3	4	5
Creative	1	2	3	4	5
Patient	1	2	3	4	5
Open minded	1	2	3	4	5
Personable	1	2	3	4	5
Hardworking	1	2	3	4	5
Consistent	1	2	3	4	5
Good communicator	1	2	3	4	5
Outspoken	1	2	3	4	5
Unique	1	2	3	4	5

15. What are the sources of funding for your college expenses?

Source	Amount of Funding (approximate dollars)
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

16. Is there anything else you would like to share about the Trinity Education program, the students, Trinity, or teaching as a career? Please feel free to comment below. Thank you for your assistance.